

No. 173 MARCH 1983

# *Spearhead*

40p



## Scenario OF War

Will Soviet missiles be fired at Western Europe? (pages 8 & 9)



Nationalist comment

# WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

## No cause for joy

Predictably, the supporters of the Government are giving it a big pat on the back as a result of the news that inflation is now down to a figure of 4.9 per-cent, and it is widely predicted that Mrs. Thatcher is to be doubly encouraged by this news to call an early general election, making the lowering of the inflation rate a vital part of the Tory platform.

In reality, however, there is no reason whatsoever to congratulate the Government on its achievement on the inflation front. The Opposition, for once, is right in saying that a lowering of the inflation rate has been bought at a price of well over 3 million unemployed. The Opposition would be even more right were it to level with the public as to how this has happened, but of course it will not do so.

Inflation has in fact been cut by the Government's action in forcing up money-lending rates to an astronomical level and

thus discouraging those employment-creating sectors of the economy from borrowing — indeed making it quite impossible for most of them to borrow without going broke. Industry has thereby been absolutely starved of investment.

With much less being borrowed, and even allowing for the higher interest rates on what borrowings there are, there is bound to be a substantial downfall in the rate of increase in that portion of the wealth of the nation that goes to meet the servicing of bank loans. As it is this portion that is the cause of inflation, a much lower rate of inflation is the natural result.

The Government, however, could have arrived at the same result of a vast reduction in inflation **without** starving the economy of investment and thus creating more unemployment: it could have allowed bank lending rates to find their natural level in the market but forbidden the banks to lend any money in excess of deposits. In other words, it could have established by statute a 100 per-cent reserve backing to deposits, thus making it impossible for the banks, by making loans, to add to the monetary supply. It then could have increased the latter by its own action of bringing new money into circulation to finance public expenditure, creating the money interest-free and issuing it in quantities carefully geared to run parallel with the resulting rise in the national product.

And a rise in the national product would undoubtedly result, for such an action by the Government would lift immense tax burdens off industry, thus releasing money for investment and thus creating expansion and jobs. All that would then be needed to regenerate the economy would be the complementary policy of ensuring markets

to absorb the new production of which industry would be capable. The correct policy would be to create these markets by the progressive closure of the British home market to manufactured imports, a policy which, even in the event of 100 per-cent retaliation, would put at least £5,000 million more business Britain's way.

But the Government will not do these things because it remains the willing lackey of the banking and international financial system, which needs a high level of international trade to survive.

The Government can therefore only achieve a significant drop in the inflation rate by starving industry of money and the nation of jobs — which is what it has done. This is no cause for congratulation, nor for the Government being given another 5 years in office.

## Alternative to Fortress Falklands

Now that the causes of the Falklands War have been extensively argued, emphasis is shifting to the question of future British policy on the islands. The Government has stated that in its view there is at the present time no alternative policy to that of 'Fortress Falklands', i.e. the maintenance of a size of military presence on the islands far out of proportion to the number of their inhabitants and which in fact would work out for the next three years to over £1 million per Falklander.

The Opposition parties say that this is much too heavy price to pay and therefore Britain must opt for the other alternative of an eventual 'accommodation' with Argentina.

It is noteworthy that when spokesmen of these parties speak of such matters they always use sweet and reasonably-sounding phrases like 'accommodation', 'agreement', 'reconciliation', etc. Not surprisingly of course, for they sound so much better than 'surrender'. But any realist will recognise that surrender is in fact the only possible kind of 'accommodation' that will ever be acceptable to the Argentines and thus have any meaning. It would be far better if these spokesmen were honest with us and told us that surrender is in fact what they have in mind.

What do we think? Well, first of all we think that if the price named by those whose job it is to make defence estimates is in fact the price we must pay for 'Fortress Falklands' then it is a price that should and must be paid. The Falklanders are British people and entitled to our protection, and that should override any considerations of economics. Once we start to calculate whether British people, our kith and kin, should be defended on the basis of considerations of book-keeping, we may as well

# SPEARHEAD

No. 173 MARCH 1983

Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex

Editor: John Tyndall

*Spearhead* exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisations *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

*Spearhead* welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.



abandon any further pretensions to nationhood — we just won't be fit to survive.

We do not necessarily accept, however, that 'Fortress Falklands' on the scale of expense that the Government is now talking about is the only other option to that of surrender.

We believe that the size of defence force that Britain needs to keep permanently on the islands need not be by any means large. What we do need are just two things.

One is that such a force is large enough and good enough to convince the Argentines that if they ever tried landing again they would have such a fight on their hands that they could only succeed by employing forces much bigger than previously and by still suffering immense casualties.

The other is a total commitment by the British Government that, in the event of such an invasion ultimately succeeding, Britain would again send a task force to repossess the islands, just as she did before. For such a commitment to have the desired effect, it would have to include the pledge that if Argentina took the Falklands during a period of Labour Government in Britain and that Government did not send a force to invade, a Conservative Government would do so immediately on being returned to power.

It was Napoleon who once said that in warfare the moral prevailed over the material by a ratio of ten to one. And he ought to know.

## Rock bottom

Labour local government leaders in the Hackney area of London, so it is reported, are making a big political issue out of an incident that occurred at the police station in Stoke Newington a few weeks ago. A Black youth, Colin Roach, with a medical history of depression, walked into the station with a shotgun and promptly killed himself.

It was utterly predictable that there would be some Black lunatics in the area who would seize upon the fact that the young man's suicide took place in a police station to claim that fact who shot him. So it turned out. Local Black agitators, and some Black agitators not so local, have mounted a massive campaign demanding an 'enquiry' into Roach's death. There have been several protest marches, almost all of them disorderly in their outcome, and the battle cry against the police has also been taken up by *West Indian Voice*, a Black newspaper.

What is appalling about the affair is that now the Labour councillors have joined in the campaign against the police. Sensing the many Black votes to be won by such a witchhunt, they have added their voice to the clamour for an enquiry, with several

public statements containing the thinly veiled innuendo that the police murdered Roach.

The likelihood of such a murder taking place in a police station is so remote that these local politicians must surely recognise that the whole campaign for an enquiry is an absurdity. This has not prevented them cynically exploiting the issue for their own political ends. It just shows how close to rock bottom the Labour Party has sunk.

## Squalid bill

Not that the Tories have any more reason to be proud of themselves. What more contemptible affair could have occurred in political history than the passing through Parliament of Willie Whitelaw's second bill to permit the entry into Britain of the husbands and fiancées of immigrant women with 'British' nationality?

Readers will remember that the first bill, introduced in flagrant violation of solemn election promises, failed to get through the House because of an unlikely alliance against it of right-wing Tories, who objected to it because it was too liberal and in any event betrayed an election pledge, and Labour and Alliance MPs, who opposed it for the opposite reason that it was not liberal enough!

Willie's next ploy was to produce a new bill which differed only fractionally from his previous one by extending from one year to two the time within which a male immigrant must leave Britain if his marriage breaks up. He then introduced the bill to a preliminary meeting of Tory MPs with the threat that if those who voted against the previous one, or abstained from voting on it, did not vote for the new one he would introduce a third bill much more 'liberal'



**WILLIE WHITELAW**  
Contemptible tactics

and thereby guaranteed to get through Parliament on the votes of the Opposition parties. At the same time he mixed the carrot with the stick by appealing to Tories' sense of party loyalty and stressing the need to present a united party front in the run-up to the next General Election. His tactics succeeded; the 'right-wing' opposition folded up; only 5 voted against the bill and 10 more abstained, with the result that it got through the House. The requirements of party politics had triumphed over any considerations for the future of the British nation.

One doesn't know which deserves the greater disgust: Willie Whitelaw for his squalid and cynical political manoeuvring in which country was sacrificed to party; or the feeble right-wing 'rebels' of the party for their abject capitulation.

From out of all this one thing becomes clear: those who look for the salvation of this country to those on the Tory Right are indulging in pathetic fantasy.

## Nanny says: belt up!

So we must all now wear seat belts when driving our cars — and woe betide anyone who fails to comply! The State acting as Nanny, having shown complete lack of will to impose its authority in those areas of national life where authority is truly needed, puffs itself up with this piece of petty authoritarianism which is just a colossal nuisance to everybody.

The biggest nuisance of all will of course be to the police. We are told constantly that our police force is undermanned and overstretched, that it leaves large numbers of serious crimes unsolved because it simply does not have the time and resources to investigate them properly.

Now further time and resources on the part of the police are to be wasted on the enforcement of this ridiculous new law. Just add up the police time and manpower involved in looking for offenders as they drive along the streets, then stopping them to book them, then filling in reports relating to the bookings, then, sometimes at least, coming to court to testify against them — and think of an equivalent time not spent protecting the public from muggers, rapists, murderers, burglars, bank-robbers, drug-traffickers and the rest. It all adds up to an appalling misuse of the nation's resources for the upholding of law and order, doesn't it?

We have often said that in a society governed by the values of liberalism there is much too much emphasis on 'rights'. Nevertheless, if there is one human and individual right that we think ought to be preserved it is the right of a person to take a risk with their own life.

But Nanny apparently says no.



# WHOSE QUEEN? WHOSE COUNTRY?

**SPEARHEAD**  
comments on  
that Oxford  
debate



Tariq Ali (left) has a drink with other debaters.  
What was he doing in a debate about fighting for Britain?

IT MIGHT at first sight seem reassuring that the Oxford Union last month reversed its verdict of the 1930s and rejected by 275 votes to 152 a motion that "this house would not fight for Queen and Country." We should, however, be on our guard against any complacency that might arise out of this result: it does not indicate by any means that Nationalism and patriotism have taken over at Oxford.

On the contrary, it can be seen — if the attitudes of the opposers of the motion are anything to go by — that those in favour of fighting for Queen and Country would agree to do so for a quite complex variety of reasons, by no means all of them good ones. Take Lord Beloff, for instance, who reversed his position of 50 years ago by joining the 'Queen and Country' ranks. In an article in the *Daily Mail* he explained his change of sides. He was convinced, he said, by the wreckage of Europe that he saw in 1945, which

according to his reasoning and that of others like him at the time, was the result of a "failure of deterrence." He went on to cite the more recent example of the Falklands War as a conflict which came about for the same reasons — General Galtieri and Co. being persuaded to attack the islands by the belief that Britain was too pacifist to fight for them.

Not that this is a bad reason for opposing pacifism; on the contrary, it is a thoroughly sensible one. But, sensible though it may be, it is not itself a justification for fighting for one's country. All sorts of people opposed Hitler in the 1930s and all sorts of people oppose the Argentine Junta today for reasons not in any way connected with the determination to preserve their nationhood or territory. One group of people who opposed Hitler, for instance, is that very group from which Lord Beloff himself comes. World Jewry wanted the destruction of the

German Fuhrer from the very first day he came to power, and not for the reason that he threatened those nations amid which the various sections of Jewry had chosen to reside but solely because Hitler's system put at mortal danger the whole foundations of Jewish political, financial, spiritual and cultural hegemony over the world. 'Queen and Country' had nothing whatsoever to do with British Jews' share in the anti-Nazi blood lust, nor indeed did American patriotism have any bearing on the attitudes towards Germany held by Lord Beloff's racial cousins in the United States; on the contrary, it was the most fervent patriots both here and in the US who were opposed to a war policy *viz-a-viz* Germany because they knew that if they were called to fight they would not be doing so for the sakes of their countries but for entirely different causes. On the other hand, what Lord Beloff really meant when he said that he would fight for Queen and Country was that he would fight for the country of his domicile if it were in a war with National Socialism — or perhaps the brand of Fascism recently prevailing in Argentina.

## ON ABOUT JEWS

Mr. Douglas Hogg, MP, and son of Lord Hailsham, made a contribution to the debate which seemed to follow in the footsteps of Lord Beloff. Replying to Mrs. Helen John, the anti-nuclear protester, he asked where did Mrs. John imagine that British Jews would be today had Hitler not been resisted.

Now this is a very interesting question if treated as a subject in its own right but one fails to see what it has to do with the defence of Queen and Country. The nature of the debate was not whether the house would fight for the survival of British Jews but whether it would fight for the survival of Britain. That one of the leading spokesmen in favour of being ready to fight should cite the welfare of Jews as if it were a significant reason for doing so casts dubious light on the whole meaning of the debate.

*Contd. on page 14*



## RHODESIA

# Ian Smith's chickens coming home to roost

*THE TRUTH* about Rhodesia, now called 'Zimbabwe', can no longer help the former Rhodesians, but it is not too late, it is hoped, to strengthen people in other countries who, whether they know it or not, are locked in a struggle with the same revolutionary forces that produced the results we now see in Zimbabwe.

Ivor Benson was employed as Information Adviser to the Rhodesian Government during 1964/65, resigning soon after UDI; he has for many years been a close observer of developments all over the African continent, and writes: *There are few places, if any, where the revolutionary forces have been more clearly identified or their methods more clearly exposed than in Rhodesia, making that small country and its sufferings an object lesson for the whole world. This article first appeared in BEHIND THE NEWS, of P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp 1740, South Africa.*

**THE IAN SMITH SAGA**, which has made headlines all over the world since 1964, is drawing to a close.

Rhodesia's "Good old Smithy" finds himself transformed into Zimbabwe's "Poor old Smithy", the persecuted leader of an embattled White minority party in what is now on its way to becoming yet another African one-party Marxist state.

Mr. Smith and several of his Republican Front colleagues were hauled off to a police station because their presence at an art exhibition looked too much like defiance of a recently imposed ban on political meetings.

His farm near Gwelo (now Gweru) was ransacked by the police and all his personal papers seized. A couple of days later, under *de facto* arrest, Mr. Smith was taken to Salisbury (now Harare) to be present when his town house was also ransacked and more personal papers carried off.

Since then, the police have descended on his farm again and have seized all his personal weapons — shotgun, pistols, etc.

Ian Smith has become, as one South African newspaper headlined it, "the target of Zimbabwean fury"; and Republican Front members of parliament have expressed the fear that their leader's life might even be in danger.

Why the persecution of the leader of Zimbabwe's White minority?

Answer: because Mr. Smith was recently

by  
**IVOR BENSON**

in the United States and Britain bitterly complaining about the Mugabe Government and calling on leaders of the so-called "free world" not to allow Zimbabwe to become a one-party state and to slide into the Marxist sink-hole.

### Greek tragedy

Since 1963, when Ian Smith succeeded to the leadership of the country's White community, the Rhodesian drama has unfolded with the iron inevitability of a Greek tragedy.

There is only one way in which the latest news from Zimbabwe can be rendered intelligible and worthy of any comment, and



**IAN SMITH IN THE SIXTIES**  
Now a pathetic figure

that is to re-tell the story in the fewest and simplest words, and to show that what is now happening is the inescapable consequence of what Mr. Smith believed and tried to do — in defiance of repeated warnings. This is something Mr. Smith never understood, still does not understand, and probably never will understand.

The whole truth is compressed into one paragraph in the September 1977 issue of

### Behind the News:

"Mr. Ian Smith is not a conservative, let alone a rightwing extremist, never was a conservative and never will be. He is a liberal or progressive, or leftist, always was and always will be. Thus an astonishing situation has been created in which a dyed-in-the-wool liberal finds himself today the prime minister and leader of a small country which has adopted a posture of defiance towards a revolutionary imperialism, which is essentially liberal, leftist, call it what you will."\*

The weirdness of Ian Smith's behaviour as leader of the Rhodesian Front party (RF) can, therefore, be easily explained: he was playing a double game; he was betraying the party whose programme of principles he had publicly endorsed; and he was doing this from a position of strength, profoundly convinced that he was advancing the cause of truth and justice, and always covertly supported from sources outside his RF party.

Therefore, it was not the outside powers trying to enforce revolutionary change in Rhodesia that Mr. Smith was fighting — his real opponents were the RF members of parliament who had chosen him as party leader and prime minister plus, of course, the rank and file members of the RF, whose energy and enthusiasm had secured the defeat of the frankly liberal United Federal Party in 1962.

No one expressed this portion of the truth more simply and more clearly than did Sir Harold Wilson in a BBC interview in September last year (1982):

"I got on very well with him" (Mr. Smith), "but there were a number of occasions when we had negotiations when we would agree and all was going well. Then he would go back and the evil geniuses got at him; they held a pistol at his head; they were going to sack him."

More confirmation of Mr. Smith's real role will be found in the weirdly ambivalent attitude of Rhodesia's Big Money Argus Company Press, later to be converted into all-out encouragement and support.

In a word, Mr. Smith, as a dedicated liberal and proponent of multiracialism, had decided that there was no better position from which to advance his "ideals" than from inside a political party that was most effectively opposing them. And the then newly created Rhodesian Front, with all its political novices, was the ideal environment for this bold exercise.

As events were to show, Ian Smith was a shrewd, tough and ruthless party-political

*Contd. overleaf*



## IAN SMITH'S CHICKENS COMING HOME TO ROOST

(Contd. from prev. page)

operator who knew very well how to exploit to the utmost a psychology of group dynamics which makes it well nigh imperative for any group that is threatened from without to render blind loyalty and submission to its leader.\*\*

### Animal Farm

The Rhodesians were thus reduced to a moral condition described in the Gospels: Having eyes they could not see, having ears they could not hear, and having minds they could neither understand nor remember.

How else are we to explain the dazed incomprehension with which rank and file members of the RF, even members of parliament, even cabinet ministers, looked on as one by one all those "evil geniuses" of whom Harold Wilson was later to speak, the genuine opponents of the socialist world revolution, were defamed, tricked, driven out of the party, or in some other way deprived of any influence?

Today when Ian Smith complains so bitterly of being persecuted, and about the suppression of Press freedom, it is appropriate, surely, that he should be reminded that it was by applying precisely the same methods that he made possible the Rhodesian transformation of which he now complains.

In particular, he could be reminded of the way in which he persecuted Mr. Wilfred Brooks,† and crushed Mr. Brooks's monthly journal *Rhodesian Property and Finance*, a paper whose great offence it was that it dared to publish the truth — that same truth which Mr. Smith needs now if he is ever to understand his present nasty and imperilled situation.

Many more were to be the target of Mr. Smith's enmity as, in an atmosphere of bewilderment, reminiscent of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, he picked off one by one those who opposed him or might do so in future, the most important of these, of course, being cabinet ministers (such as William Harper, John Gaunt, Lord Graham).

Having got rid of the men whom Harold Wilson himself would have recommended for elimination, Mr. Smith then summoned reinforcements from the ranks of those who had always hitherto been the most vehement opponents of the Rhodesian Front, namely, the Zionists.\*\*

With the help of these dedicated proponents of racial integration (who themselves practise the exact opposite), Ian Smith was ready for an exciting acceleration of progress towards the fulfilment of his own political dreams. Indeed, without this assistance there can be no doubt that he would have been a "goner", sacked, as Harold Wilson always feared — for at last there were signs that the Rhodesians were beginning to wake up.



### WHITES UNDER SIEGE

This White woman holding her child carries a revolver for protection everywhere she goes. This is the kind of climate in which Europeans now live in the country that was once peaceful and orderly Rhodesia.

Twelve RF members of parliament rebelled and formed an opposition Rhodesian Action Party (RAP).

A deputy minister attached to the Prime Minister's office rebelled and resigned from his job. The national chairman of the RF Party — no less — rebelled and resigned.

### Blind hope

All that now remained of the original party was a clustering together of weak elements, accurately described by Dr. R. Gayre of Gayre, in a personal letter:

"There is a big mass of people in leading positions everywhere who will not face facts, who would prefer to live in a conservative atmosphere but rather than face up to the aggressive dynamism of the left will either remain silent or will even try to persuade the real conservatives to compromise with the extreme forces of destruction, in some blind hope that this will appease and at least gain for them some respite from the strain of making decisions."

These, never numerous but most of them well positioned in the party structure, Dr. Gayre correctly described as "the real

traitors".

There were, of course, a few exceptions, members of the party who tried in vain to rescue the Rhodesian Front from within, one of the most notable of these being Lord Graham (the Duke of Montrose, a signatory to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in 1965).

Now commanding a party fortress manned only by self-selected compromisers and appeasers, and heavily dependent on the wealth and influence of his new-found Zionist allies, Ian Smith responded to the RAP challenge swiftly and ruthlessly — for he was now in great danger of losing his grip on the electorate.

Having already crushed the honest and outspoken *Rhodesian Property and Finance*, and with nothing to fear from the mighty Argus Company Press, Mr. Smith made a grab at radio and television (RBC/RTV), expelled the board of governors, sacked the corporation's director-general Harvey Ward, and handed undivided control of RBC/RTV to Zionist Elly Bloomberg, whom he had recently appointed Minister of Information.

Those board members and the director-general had shown no signs of being hostile to Mr. Smith, and there was no reason to suppose that they might throw in their lot with the RAP rebels; but they had tried, with varying degrees of success, to be fair in the presentation of news and views, and could, therefore, hardly be expected at a word of command to introduce the policy of vicious partisanship which Mr. Smith required.

### Electorate bemused

With the mind of the bemused electorate now almost completely sealed off against dissident voices, and all the media available as channels for his propaganda, Mr. Smith dissolved parliament, called a general election and made short work of all his opponents.

Where now are all those Zionists who so zealously rallied to Ian Smith's support, boasting among themselves of being once again "over-represented" in parliament and public affairs?

They have all deserted yesteryear's "Mister Prime Minister", the gey simpleton whom they had flattered with the notion that he was their leader and they his admiring and devoted followers. Not only did they desert him; they joined the other side and are now sitting pretty, exempt from all harassment by Zimbabwe's new "rulers", prospering mightily as local proxies of the external revolutionary powers, and in a deeply covert and indirect way probably even the country's new rulers.

As was only to be expected, therefore, it was Zimbabwe's Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce (actually the real minister), Mr. John Landau, who on November 28 issued a statement on behalf of the country's

Contd. on next page



"White businessmen" taking Mr. Smith severely to task for all the unkind statements he had made about the Mugabe Government during his recent visit to the United States and Britain.††

## The Grand Design

So, why is Ian Smith now in trouble?

Those who backed him in the past and his admirers, like Harold Wilson, will tell him that his "ideals" have been "realised": Zimbabwe has been "liberated" and admitted to the United Nations amid universal applause as a "free and independent nation" in which every form of racial discrimination is condemned — or so the world has been led to understand.

Why, then, does Mr. Smith not go along with the country's new rulers? Why is he out in the cold when in the opinion of liberals and leftists all over the world he should be helping to make a success of "the great multiracial experiment"?

Answer: because the Zimbabwe that has come into existence is almost entirely out of register with the picture he had formed in his mind of a "new" Rhodesia which was to have been an example and a source of inspiration to the whole world.

What inspired Ian Smith and justified a considerable exercise of deception and ruthlessness was certainly not a Marxist one-party state — and he could never have imagined such a state enjoying international recognition and receiving seemingly boundless financial aid from nations which had always echoed his own "ideals" and his distaste for Marxism.

Mr. Smith's present unhappy situation was foreshadowed in a sentence written by historian Oswald Spengler, shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia:

"There is no proletarian movement, not even a Communist one, that does not operate in the interest of money, in the direction indicated by money, and for the period permitted by money, and all this without the idealist in its ranks having the faintest suspicion of the fact."

Ian Smith had put himself on the side of the 20th century proletarian-revolutionary movement (that is why Harold Wilson called him "a nice guy"), deaf to repeated warnings that what the powers of money wanted was something quite different from what he had himself conjured up in his mind as an "ideal" solution of his country's political problems. On the other hand, the powers of money were never deceived by Mr. Smith; they always knew exactly what they were doing and what they wanted, and they knew that Mr. Smith's brainspun political idealism was something that could be harnessed to their purposes.

Therefore, what has emerged in Rhodesia is not what Mr. Smith imagined and worked for but what the representatives of money decided — for it is these who have the power to make things happen.

There is something pathetic about the tortured language in which Ian Smith

expressed his bewilderment and disappointment in a recent interview with the London *Daily Mail*:

"We are sliding towards Marxism. This country was supposed to be a tripod, one leg representing each of the main tribal groups and one leg the Whites. Well, they have silenced the leader of the Matabele by getting rid of Joshua Nkomo. If they shut me up — and the Whites — they've got a one-legged tripod. And it'll fail. We'll become like every other part of Black Africa that's tried to go that way. Bankrupt. With governments decided only by coups."

## Truth Out of Africa

So, what was it the power-wielders of money wanted in Africa and have now achieved in Zimbabwe?

It would be hard to improve on an answer to that question supplied in 1964 by Dr. Franco Nogueira, then Foreign Minister of an embattled Portugal. Explaining what these money powers had already achieved in Africa, he said:

"A form of autonomy and independence has been created which ensures the destruction of the old forms of sovereignty and permits the setting up of new forms of sovereignty so precarious and so artificial that it is an easy matter to dominate them. A method has been adopted that leads to the transfer of political power unaccompanied by a transfer of the other forms of power, economic, cultural and military, which, in fact, determine policy. The result is that the real authority and the real control are to be found outside the frontiers of the new political units."

Dr. Nogueira added significantly:

"This ruthless political action is shielded by high ideological aims."

Those words accurately describe what has happened in Rhodesia — not a fulfilment of Ian Smith's "high ideological aims" but the triumph of an invading imperialism of money.

See how the facts fall into place to support the truth: On November 29 the Government of Zimbabwe unveiled its long-awaited \$6.2 billion economic expansion plan which will, as Robert Mugabe explained in a foreword, "set in motion an irreversible socialist trend" — with nearly half the funding to come from abroad, including \$1.2 billion actually pledged at the 1981 international "conference on reconstruction and development."

Nor was that all — a few days earlier came the news that the Government of Zimbabwe had awarded the contract for a \$65 million hotel and conference centre in Harare (Salisbury) to the Yugoslav company Energoprojekt.

Can Mr. Smith be made to understand all this? Will he ever be able to understand how and why capitalist and socialist policies have coalesced so neatly in Zimbabwe?

Will anyone ever be able to explain to him why his complaints in the United States and Britain fell on deaf ears and why, incidentally, the only newspaper that even bothered to interview him in Washington was one owned by the Moony religious sect?

The answer to such questions touching on Mr. Smith's powers of understanding, or

his willingness to understand, is almost certainly an emphatic "No!" — for any understanding now of his role in the Rhodesian tragedy must involve a repudiation of everything he ever believed or did as a politician.

At his age, now over 63, who would want to go on living after having passed on himself so horrifying a sentence of condemnation, haunted ever after by visions of the evils visited on all who trusted and followed him?

It is, therefore, hardly surprising that Ian Smith's behaviour begins to take on the appearance of an invitation to martyrdom.

"I don't worry about myself," he told the *Daily Mail* interviewer.

But his family, as his wife Janet exclaimed, are "frantic". She added: "Every time he speaks out they call up, saying, 'Oh, mum, must he go on sticking his neck out?'"

Must he? Indeed, he must, for what else can he do, now that his ideological chickens are all kites and vultures?

Meanwhile, in spite of all the harassment, and luckier than fellow parliamentarians like Wally Stuttaford and Dennis Walker, Ian Smith continues to enjoy some protection — because he is still needed to prevent a mass exodus of Zimbabwe's much-needed Whites.

Sooner or later — and it could be quite soon — Mr. Smith and his Republican Front Party will be needed no longer and will vanish from the political scene, leaving, as representatives of a much reduced "White minority", the highly influential but barely visible proxies of the revolutionary powers who are now the real rulers and owners of Zimbabwe.

## References

\* Compare Kenneth Young's book *Rhodesia and Independence*, wholly sympathetic to Ian Smith, wherein recorded interviews clearly identify Smith as a racial egalitarian, therefore a liberal. (In personal communication, Douglas Reed later regretted his flattering portrait of Smith in *The Battle for Rhodesia*, 1966).

\*\* See exposition of the "Robert Ardrey principle" in *Behind the News*, Sept. 1977 (*What Happened in Rhodesia and The Ian Smith Myth*).

\*\*\* The Zionist role in Rhodesia is explained at some length by pro-Zionist writer Dr. B. A. Kosmin in his history, *Majuta*, published in Zimbabwe in 1980. (See our review, November 82 issue).

† See *Behind the News*, July 77 (*Ian Smith v. Wilfred Brooks*).

†† We have since learned from a reliable source in Britain that Mr. Smith actually believed it might be possible to persuade the US and British governments to apply sanctions against the Mugabe regime.

Our magazine, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.

## LEAGUE REVIEW

For a new view on human affairs read *League Review*, journal of the League of St. George. This is a 24-page pictorial magazine costing 45p. Subscription rate is £5 for 8 issues (British Isles). For sample send 60p to: *League Review*, 9/11 Kensington High Street, London W8 5NP.



# SCENARIO OF WAR

In the first part of a three-part article JOHN TYNDALL examines orthodox defence planning, which rests on the assumption of a Soviet intention to invade Western Europe

**SPEARHEAD** and its ally, the British National Party tabloid *New Frontier*, have lately devoted some attention to the nuclear weapons debate, and have striven to explain to the public that a policy whereby Britain's defences rely on an American manufactured and controlled nuclear deterrent is almost as bad as a policy of no defence at all. This has led us to an examination of the whole basis of post-war military strategy, which has assumed that: (1) a Soviet armed attack on Western Europe is the most likely contingency of war to be faced by this country; and (2) no adequate deterrent or resistance to such an attack is feasible without a massive American military presence in Europe, which presence should include American nuclear weapons.

In our 'What we think' column in the January issue we went to some length to demolish this simplistic picture of the future pattern of war. Our conclusions were: (a) that it is exceedingly unlikely that any Soviet invasion of Western Europe is contemplated, and that in fact that represents a contingency of war so remote that it should be placed well down on the list of probabilities of conflict; and (b) that in the event of this unlikely contingency coming to pass it is ridiculous to suppose that it could not be dealt with by the Western European nations themselves, who possess a roughly equal pool of manpower and a far superior aggregate industrial capacity than Soviet Russia and her satellites.

This thesis, which of course offends against every tenet of 'right-wing' orthodoxy, has aroused considerable interest, and this has prompted me to think that the subject might usefully be explored in a little more depth. Our magazine and the party that it supports have always argued for completely independent British armed forces, including nuclear forces. It is important that it should be recognised that there is much more to our case in this regard than mere nationalistic sentiment, and that practical necessity enforces our view at every point. Let us look at what gives rise to this necessity.

## RED MOTIVES

To begin with, we need hardly remind our readers of our record as unswerving opponents of everything that is represented by Communism. We are prepared to accord to the leaders of Communism motives much more evil than any that have been accorded

to them by the representatives of the orthodox 'right' in Britain; in fact we still regard Communism as the most malignant spiritual cancer in the world today, and a cancer which, furthermore, will not be eliminated for good and all except by methods of at least equal ruthlessness to those which Communists employ themselves. Sometime soon in the future a reckoning is going to come with Communism and we are convinced that that reckoning cannot be

industrial efficiency than their counterparts West of the Iron Curtain. To keep them in order, Russia has three times since 1945 had to wave the big stick, and on two of those occasions put the stick to use by invading Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, in the first instance suppressing revolt only after the bloodiest conflict and with considerable casualties. The third occasion has been the recent bout of trouble in Poland, in which Moscow felt obliged to



SOVIET TANKS AND INFANTRY ON MANOEUVRES  
Will they ever attack Western Europe?

resolved except by methods which will include the use of force.

This, however, is very different to saying that such a reckoning will occur in the form of an East-West, Soviet-Capitalist armed conflict. The evil nature and motives of the Communist leaders certainly would place no moral restraint upon them in respect of starting a world war if they believed they could win it and profit by it. The fact is, however, that they do not entertain any such belief; on purely practical grounds they recognise that victory for Communism by means of a world war against the West is a total non-starter.

Russia's satellites in Eastern Europe comprise a population aggregate of about 80 millions. With the exception of East Germany, they are countries of far lower

inform its Polish viceroys that they had better crush the rebels by force or it would send in its own troops to do so. Right now the Kremlin is nervously watching events in the territory of its immediate Western neighbour, hoping against hope that that threat will never have to be carried out, as it knows that Soviet troops, if they were to enter Poland in the role of invaders, would find themselves in a hell of a fight, for whatever may be said in criticism of the Poles cowardice and unwillingness to die for their country have never been among their vices. The Soviets could of course prevail eventually against any Polish resistance by sheer weight, but this would be at an enormous cost — in blood, in economics and in the fomenting of much discontent at home.

*Contd. on next page*



Sovereignty over Eastern Europe, in other words, has its price. But it is a price which up to now has been considered by the Soviets as just about worth paying. The satellites yield up useful economic tribute to their masters, and strategically they offer a buffer zone protecting Russia itself against a possible attack from the West — an unlikely contingency, we may think, but one which we must understand exists in Russian minds as a result of their paranoid fear of a resurgent Germany.

## EMBARRASSMENT IN AFGHANISTAN

A much more dubious advantage, as the Soviets have found, is sovereignty over Afghanistan. It is almost certain, as *Spearhead* pointed out at the time, that that country was invaded with a view to extending Russia's border with Iran and thus assisting the process of bringing the latter into the Soviet sphere of influence. By now, however, the Russians must be counting the cost. A comparatively small and primitive nation is offering fierce resistance and tying down Soviet forces currently estimated at 100,000 men — with further harm to the already precarious Soviet economy. Russia would now probably like to get out of Afghanistan but does not know how she can do so without catastrophic loss of face and alarming ramifications in respect of her evidence of will to hold onto her other colonies. When British leaders demonstrated that they wouldn't fight for India or Ireland, they showed the green light everywhere to those who sought the eclipse of the British Empire.

In addition to all this, let it not be forgotten that the Soviet machine of occupation, so far as it presently extends, is kept running solely by aid from the Western powers — from America first and foremost but from Western Europe to a considerable extent as well. Regularly every year, Soviet agricultural failures have been prevented from exercising their full effect on the Russian populace by grain imports from Canada and the United States and by such things as butter supplies at knock-down prices from out of Common Market surpluses.

Now contemplate against this background what would be involved in a Soviet invasion and permanent occupation of Western Europe. We have already seen that Russia and its satellites would be taking on an enemy of about equal manpower and much greater industrial capacity. They would be fighting further and further from their homelands while their adversaries would be fighting in defence of their homelands. Soviet troops themselves would be imbued with a very questionable will to sustain that fight and those of the East European satellites with a much lesser one. Taking Poland as just one example, if she is unhappy in the present situation with Russia, just what sort of an ally would she become if her young men were being sent by the



## SOVIET LEADER ANDROPOV

Not so foolish as to imagine he could stage a successful invasion of Western Europe.

millions to die on West European soil for a cause in which only a tiny minority of Poles had the slightest interest?

With the potential balance of military power tipped heavily in favour of the Western European nations in view of their vastly superior industry and technology, the only conceivable chance that the Soviets would have of victory would lie in using their presently larger forces to overrun the Continent before the greater war potential of their opponents was properly mobilised. The failure of substantial Soviet forces thus to overrun and subdue Afghanistan 3 years after they attacked that country makes it clear that in a conventional war they would stand no chance whatever of achieving such an objective; the sole chance of their doing so would lie in their use of nuclear weapons.

Irrespective of whether America would then retaliate on behalf of Western Europe, Britain and France both have their own nuclear armoury. It is a combined armoury of considerably less strike power than that of the Soviets and in a nuclear fight to the finish the latter clearly could obliterate us before we could obliterate her. But just what benefit would this bring to the Soviets?

Even were their anti-missile defences sufficient to prevent nine out of ten British or French missiles getting through, this would still leave us with the capacity to reduce to rubble Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and a dozen other Soviet cities and/or industrial complexes — with a loss of life and disruption of the economy too awful to contemplate. For what conceivable gain would Russia's leaders be prepared to take such a risk?

The only gain in the offing would be the

domination of a devastated Western Europe, and what sort of a gain would that be? Russia and her increasingly unenthusiastic satellite forces would have the job of occupying and policing for all eternity a vast area containing about 320 million people comprising some of the most intelligent and advanced races of the world. I say 'for all eternity' because the evidence of the Soviet occupation of Eastern Europe over the past 38 years does not suggest that those occupied will ever be induced to become such enthusiastic Communists and willing subjects of the Soviet Empire that they can be kept in subjection by any other means than force. In the meantime, the Sovietisation of their economies would mean that the production surpluses that they are now able to export to Russia on such generous terms would almost certainly no longer be available, while the reliability of America as a continued provider of grain and technology to the Soviet system would, to say the least, be highly questionable.

## FANTASY WORLD

Just a few seconds' thought about this scenario should be enough to convince any rationally thinking person that we have already long crossed the borderline between the real world and the world of horror fantasy. It just isn't on, is it? Such a dream terminates immediately its ramifications have been thought through in the chess-master minds of the Kremlin's rulers. In the wildly unlikely event of it getting through that barrier, it would flounder in the mud clogging Russian tank-tracks not far West of the Elbe and on the freezing slopes of the Alps, where opposition to the Red Army would make passage somewhat more difficult than it was for Hannibal in days of yore — or if not that in the quick realisation that the Soviet Capital had become a Hiroshima and further Hiroshimas would litter the Russian landscape within a matter of hours.

I have said that the leaders of Communism are men of evil motives but most certainly they are not mad — indeed the evidence of the whole post-war era points to their being the very opposite of mad; they are in fact men of decidedly greater political brainpower than most of the mental dwarfs who hold the highest offices in the 'democracies'. If the latter are daft enough to imagine that they would contemplate such an invasion of the West, they themselves are certainly not daft enough to entertain any such contemplation.

What then is Communism's objective? Does it not remain world domination? Certainly it does, but let us be clear about what we mean by Communism and what practical methods exist for the exercise of world domination. In the second part of this article next month we will examine these questions.

Contd. next month



*Coming of age in Samoa*  
(Derek Freeman), Harvard  
University Press. Price un-  
known.

# SOCIOLOGY TAKES A KNOCK

THE LAST FEW YEARS have seen a startling increase in the amount of time devoted in our schools to the teaching of 'Social Studies'. The very title of this subject is enough to turn most Nationalists red with rage, and quite rightly so since most of the teachers of this 'science' are 'red' in another and far more dangerous context.

Having said this, I suggest that 'Social Studies' is a subject that we will ignore at our peril. It is a subject which is used to assist in the brainwashing of our children by Marxist school teachers and, so far, there has been little that could be done about it. Now, however, thanks to a book by Derek Freeman, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology at the Australian National University, we have a weapon with which to fight back against the communist influence among our children in the name of 'Social Studies'.

Modern sociologists base a great deal of their teaching upon the work of one Margaret Mead who in 1928 wrote a book entitled *Coming of Age in Samoa*. Mead had been a pupil of the notorious Professor Franz Boas of Columbia University, New York. Boas was an advocate of 'cultural determinism' and fiercely disputed almost any biological role at all in the determination of behaviour, individual or mass. Margaret Mead set out to prove him right.

In preparation for her book she spent three years living in Samoa. She wrote of a South Seas paradise where crime was unheard of, rape was non-existent, the people were unenvious, gentle and kind, there was no competition and little or no religion. All of which proves (of course!) that Karl Marx was correct and so are the beard-and-sandals brigade, so many of whom now pollute the once honourable teaching profession.

## INFLUENCE ON STUDENTS

The extent of Margaret Mead's influence upon generations of students is not to be under-estimated. Practically every time some savage mugger gets a ridiculous probation order, investigation would lead from 'Social Enquiry Report' to social workers' textbook, to some university lecturer and from there directly back to the theories and findings of Margaret Mead. Incredible as it may seem, when thousands of blacks riot in London, dozens, if not hundreds, of 'social workers' (all highly paid people subsidised by you and me) refer to the work of Margaret Mead to explain the phenomenon. Mead is to the sociologist what Wesley is to the Methodist.

Now, however, thanks to Professor Freeman's work, the whole profession of

sociology has been thrown into disarray. For years they have cited Mead's work to 'prove' that it is almost impossible for children from slums to grow up without a deep resentment

## Review by RAY HILL

of society or a hatred for authority. Professor Freeman is too polite directly to accuse Mead of falsifying her findings; instead he says that she was probably misled by the mickey-taking Samoans. It may have been kinder and less cruel to draw the more obvious inference!

## DEMOLISHED

Professor Freeman has not merely produced a work contradictory to that of Mead; he has totally demolished her. Mead said that the Islanders were not religious; in fact they knew the Bible back to front! Professor Freeman does not merely state this; he proves it by quoting from the archives of the London Missionary Society, whose members had visited and taught in Samoa. He produces official records of rape cases that took place at the very time that Mead was researching her book in which she assured countless thousands of students that such a crime was unheard of in Samoa. He has unearthed an American Government report, made at the relevant time, which describes Samoan society as "intensely competitive and deeply religious." Freeman argues that

Mead's glaring inaccuracies are a product of the Samoan sense of humour plus an element of "seeing what she wanted to see!"

Mead advocated 'free love', telling us that Samoan promiscuity explained the 'fact' that there was no rape in this society. Freeman shows us that the 'free love' of the Samoans produced a rape rate two and a half times greater than that of the United States at that time. He refrains from drawing the obvious comparison with the increase in both promiscuity and rape in our own society in recent years!

I wonder whether the 'Social Studies' teachers in our more way-out modern schools will now be telling our children that there is definite data to prove that promiscuity, or 'free love', leads to an increase in the crime of rape? If they do not, we can now complain, not only from the standpoint of traditional moral values and religious conviction, but on the basis that they are being unscientific. Nothing could be calculated to hit these spurious 'scientists' harder than that.

We can openly cite the work of Professor Freeman, a distinguished and totally apolitical academic, in support of many of our ideas. We can also dispute almost anything said by sociologists who have qualified by doing a thesis on the work of Mead — and that is about eighty per-cent of those presently practising!

This book is heavy going at times but it is well worth the effort by anyone who likes to rely on facts in addition to sound 'gut feeling'.

MARGARET  
MEAD  
With one of  
her Samoan  
friends in  
1925





IT IS sometimes very valuable to be able to step back from the rough and tumble of the political fray and view one's political efforts from a different perspective — in short, to visualise and understand the historical significance of what it is one is fighting for.

That this stepping back is possible at all is due mainly to the work of two historians — Arnold Toynbee and Oswald Spengler. According to Toynbee in his 12 volume *A Study of History*<sup>1</sup> each of what he called 'civilisations' have certain features in common — for instance, all civilisations are man's successful response to either a geographical or a social challenge, each civilisation possessing a 'time of troubles' and each ending in a Universal State or Empire. Thus the Hellenic or Greek civilisation arose from the physical challenge of the sea around the Greek islands; its Universal State was the Roman Empire (31 BC — 378 AD) and its time of troubles was from the Second Peloponnesian War (431 BC) until the establishment by Julius Caesar of the Roman Empire.

All this might be of purely academic interest were it not for the fact that Toynbee's model shows that the Universal

# IMPERIUM

## The destiny of the West

primarily of a physical challenge and which possesses the 'identification mark' of a unique spirit, the differences vanish. What remains is only a difference of emphasis and approach. This 'identification mark' of spirit finds its most obvious expression in a higher culture's art, philosophy and science, and such cultures or civilisations as defined include our own as well as the Hellenic and the Japanese. The spirit of the Japanese higher culture, for example, is represented by the code of Bushido, the religion of Zen, the art of Haiku and the school of painting characterised by Sesshu.

For our own culture, it is very evident that the Faustian spirit has suffered a severe

degenerates of today for whom negro music is 'culture' and to whom pacifism is a creed, but one who, like our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, are proud of their race and prepared to die for its existence and expansion. That such potential exists in Britain today is shown by the recent Falklands conflict — and 'potential' it is, because this new type is guided not by a soft self-seeking government, which cannot even keep order on the streets of its own country, but by a strong, firm leadership committed above all else to our own race. This new type of man would above everything be aware of the traditions of his own folk, and his whole style of life would embody the nobility of his race. It is not too difficult to see the emergence of this new type in the political fighters of the British National Party — the only organisation, in Britain at least, to take a positive stand against all alien influences, particularly in music and the other arts.

## DESTRUCTION OF RACE

However, because of the grip materialism of both the Capitalist and Communist type has on our culture, because of the distortion of our spirit, it is possible that the New Order might not exist. In its place, were the fighters of our race defeated, would be a multi-racial, Communist World State where both race and personality are destroyed. As Solzhenitsyn has said: "Socialism begins by making all men equal in material matters only (this of course requires compulsion) . . . Furthermore it means that the basic element of personality — those elements which display too much variety in terms of education, ability, thought and feeling — must themselves be levelled out."<sup>6</sup>

History shows that the destiny of the West is Imperium — and yet to achieve that destiny struggle is necessary, for only struggle ennobles. The forms this struggle for Imperium will take will be as varied as the methods used by those who have a vested interest in causing the triumph of Communism and the consequent destruction of our race and all it has achieved: there will be the struggle of propaganda, of ideas — but the greatest and most important struggle will be the political one. For power, in the West, is today most readily achieved by politics. And politically, the conquest of the streets is the first priority — for it will be from such politically small foundations that our people will be won back for their race, and from them and only them can the structure of Imperium be made.

With Imperium, a new chapter in world history will begin.

### References:

- 1 Oxford University Press, 1933-61.
- 2 Vol. I, Alfred Knopf, 1926; Vol. II, 1928
- 3 Heidegger, M: 'What is Metaphysics?' (Yale University Press, 1959) p. 45
- 4 Spearhead, April 1982
- 5 Spengler, Vol. II p. 431-2
- 6 'Warning to the Western World' (Bodley Head, 1976) p. 43



NIETZSCHE  
Saw nobility  
in the will  
to power

State for the Western civilisation in which we live should start around 1993 AD, give or take about ten years, and should last well into the twenty-third century. It is the work of Spengler which provides the clue as to the nature of this Western Empire.

According to Spengler in his *Decline of the West*<sup>2</sup>, each of what he calls 'cultures' evolves and changes from Spring through to its Winter. During this Winter is the era of Caesarism, and each culture possesses what Spengler calls a 'god-feeling' or spirit: For our own culture this spirit Spengler calls 'Faustian' after Goethe's Faust — and what this Faustian spirit is is perhaps best revealed by the philosophy of Nietzsche, particularly his *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. It is a will-to-power that also ennobles.

## SPIRIT OF CULTURES

When one compares the work of Spengler and Toynbee, it is soon evident that their differences are mainly ones of terminology and emphasis: Spengler speaks of cultures, and Toynbee of civilisations. Yet if one defines a higher civilisation as a civilisation (in Toynbee's sense) which is the result

by  
**DAVID MYATT**

distortion — the Faustian values of honour and duty to one's folk, of conquest and exploration, have given way to the cult of materialism as represented by both Communism and Capitalism. As the German philosopher Heidegger said: "Europe lies in a pincers between Russia and America, which are metaphysically the same, namely in regard to their world character and their relation to the spirit."<sup>3</sup> This enfeeblement of our spirit, this distortion of the West, as has been shown in an earlier article<sup>4</sup> is essentially Jewish.

## POWERS OF THE BLOOD

Were it not for this influence, it is certain that the West would now be about to enter the period of Empire or Imperium. This Imperial Age, according to Spengler, "signifies the end of the politics of mind and money. The powers of the blood . . . resume their ancient lordship. Race springs forth, pure and irresistible — the strongest win."<sup>5</sup>

Because of the racial forces which created the West, the Imperium would arise, initially, in one Western country; its driving force could never be a slavish imitation of the past, although its inspiration would be drawn from a common folk heritage, and it would possess the same will-to-power that drove the Norsemen and which enabled the British to rule, at the height of the British Empire, nearly one-quarter of the world. But what is important about the New Order such an Imperium would establish is that its establishment would require a new type of man as foreseen by Nietzsche — not the



# **Fighting elections: basic approach**

Before dealing with the procedures to be observed in the contesting of elections, we should first give a general picture of the position that elections occupy in the party's present programme of development.

In the 1970s Nationalists devoted an enormous portion of their active efforts to a campaign aimed at getting their own candidates elected to seats in Parliament and local government. The net result of this great expenditure of effort was that two Nationalist local councillors were elected and held their seats for a very short time. At the end of the decade Nationalists did not occupy one single seat in Parliament or in local government.\*

## **FACTORS WORKING AGAINST NATIONALISM**

The opponents of Nationalism would claim that this signals a massive rejection of Nationalist policies by the British public, but such a claim is not borne out by the findings of opinion polls on the major political issues. Those polls indicate that Nationalist policies have a very wide measure of support. It so happens that this support has not yet been translated into votes for Nationalists at elections. This is the result of four main factors which have worked to our disadvantage, namely:—

(1) The British public is by nature deeply conservative (small 'c') in its voting habits and is loath to change party allegiance even when there is abundant evidence that the parties to which it is loyal have betrayed that loyalty. Often the loyalties of different sections of the public to different parties are firmly ingrained by family tradition and identification with particular social classes, and these factors are much more powerful in dictating voting patterns than any sober consideration of the issues on which the parties stand. These habits do now show signs of beginning to change but they are changing slowly. Even the newly emergent Social Democratic Party, with many powerful institutions behind it and with generous coverage in the mass media, has felt the disadvantage of the British public's reluctance to change.

(2) As we have mentioned earlier in this series, the mass media, which exert immense influence on the way people vote at elections, are wholly in the control of the enemies of Nationalism. Although this has not prevented people holding Nationalist views on many topics, it has deterred those people from voting in accordance with their views at election time; with elections pending, the media have been particularly vitriolic towards the Nationalist movement, smearing it and its candidates with slanderous propaganda. Nationalists, not possessing any counter-mass media of their own, have not been able to reply to this propaganda effectively.

(3) The Conservative Party in recent times has managed to 'pull a fast one' over a large part of the electorate by making promises to implement many policies in conformity with Nationalist principles and then breaking those promises once elected. The electorate, which does not consist mainly of shrewd political thinkers, has fallen for this trick and is likely to go on falling for it for some time yet.

(4) There is a reluctance on the part of the electorate — understandable as long as one is thinking in short-term perspectives — to give its votes to candidates or parties not likely in the immediate future to be able to exercise power, or even to influence the balance of power. The tendency therefore is to vote for the lesser evil among those parties that do presently have a share in the stakes of power, rather than to vote for the candidate or party whose policies are most closely in accord with one's inner feelings.

A combination of these four factors contributed to the electoral failure of the Nationalist movement in the 1970s. In the formulation

of a strategy for the political development of Nationalism in the present decade it is essential that we learn the lessons of the previous decade. Some Nationalists are not doing this but are continuing to batter their heads against the brick wall of establishment power by repeating the practice of fighting elections over as wide an area as possible and as often as possible, in the vain hope that the factors which have determined past electoral failure will disappear of their own accord and the long hoped for Nationalist electoral breakthrough will suddenly arrive.

Our party, in contrast, has decided on a policy in respect of elections which recognises the present political situation for what it is and acknowledges that it is not going to change overnight. We appreciate that before we can hope even to record respectable results in parliamentary or local government elections, let alone start to win them, an extensive programme of party development must be carried out. This involves the building of a really powerful and professional party organisation throughout the country; the development of our own communications media so that they can reach millions, instead of the present few thousands, and thus begin effectively to combat the propaganda of our enemies; finally, the carrying out of a thorough programme of political education in Britain whereby political consciousness is increased and Nationalist views graduate from being the merely vague sentiments that they are at present into a properly understood political doctrine which can form the basis for mass political action.

None of this should be taken to mean that we withdraw as a party from participating in elections; in fact we have not done so and do not intend doing so.

## **LIMITED OBJECTIVES**

What it does mean is that we participate in elections on a limited front and with certain limited objectives, these objectives being ones that it does lie within our power to achieve, while we do not delude ourselves in pursuing objectives that we cannot achieve.

Political parties fighting elections in the United Kingdom are able to avail themselves of certain facilities and certain rights under the law which normally are not available to parties other than those favoured by the media and by the 'establishment'. Any candidate contesting a parliamentary election has an automatic right to hire a meeting hall owned by the local council in the constituency where he is standing, and he cannot be denied that right — as Nationalists more often than not are when they apply for halls at other times. In a parliamentary election every candidate also has an automatic right, which cannot be denied under the law, to have a printed election address posted free of charge to every elector in the constituency — that is to say that, although the candidate or party must pay for the printing of the election address and the envelopes in which it is packed, and must organise or pay for the copying out of the electors' addresses on the envelopes, the actual postal delivery of the election address is performed free.

Furthermore, if any party contests 50 or more seats in a **General Election** that party qualifies to be given a 5-minute party political broadcast nationwide on both television and radio.

In addition to these rights and facilities, it is a fact that some sections of the press — although by no means all — are prepared to give some coverage to candidates standing in elections which they would not ordinarily give to the parties represented by those candidates at other times.

This all means that parties fighting elections have the opportunity to obtain certain kinds of publicity which in the ordinary scheme of things would be denied to them. They can in effect use those

*Contd. on next page*



elections as a platform for their views to which they would otherwise not have access.

This does not, however, mean that the extent of the platform and publicity increase in exact or even approximate proportion to the increase of the scale on which a party such as ours becomes involved in the election field. For instance, as was proved in the 1970s, a party outside the pale of the 'establishment' only obtains the same broadcasting time if it puts up 300 candidates as it does if it puts up 50. There is, in other words, a law of diminishing returns; as the extent of electoral activity and the expenditure of money increases, beyond a certain point the publicity benefit does not increase with it.

It is out of experience of these factors that the present election strategy of our party has been formulated. This strategy is to contest elections on a limited basis, as we have indicated, and whereby we can expect to derive the maximum profit in the way of obtaining publicity and a platform for our views.

## WINNING RECRUITS

And our purpose in availing ourselves of such a platform is not primarily to influence the electors — for we know that at the moment we will only influence a minority of them where the choice of vote is concerned — but to recruit from out of those electors committed party supporters: people who will contribute money to the party and in some cases work actively for the party.

This does not mean that we should approach elections with the

attitude that the number of votes our candidates obtain does not matter; of course the higher the vote we obtain the better for the party, and the candidate and those helping him should work hard to obtain as good a vote as possible.

What we must recognise, however, is that the size of the vote is not the **primary** thing of importance; much more important is the publicity won for the party and the recruits to membership that are obtained from that publicity. It is also vitally important that both the candidate and all other party workers involved in the election do not build up over-optimistic hopes of the vote that can be obtained, with the result later that their morale is shattered when something far short of this hoped for vote is achieved. This false optimism can very easily develop as a result of canvassing on the doorstep and in the street, where many more people are likely to express sympathy with the candidate's views than will actually vote for him when polling day arrives.

All those involved in election campaigns should therefore begin with the attitude that the principal object of the operation is to obtain a platform for Nationalism and thereby recruit party members and donors. If a respectable vote can be won, then that is a bonus — icing on the cake, as it were. Even in this latter event, however, there should at the present time be no delusions that the party is knocking on the portals of power. Our very best votes are still for a time likely in most places to be a decided minority of the votes cast.

\* The term 'Nationalist' when used throughout this series should be taken to mean **British Nationalist**, and not pertaining to the separatism of Scots, Welsh or Irish Nationalist Movements.

# A practical way in which you can help

## *Spearhead*

RECENTLY in our columns we have been forced to make urgent and frequent appeals to our readers to help us by means of financial donations to keep afloat as a publication.

While we have been exceedingly grateful to those who have responded, we do not consider this the ideal way to ensure our survival.

The ideal way is to **boost sales** of our magazine so that we progressively reduce our reliance on subsidies by means of donations.

How can this best be done? Well, we ourselves are doing all we can in this direction, but if any readers have any ideas they think we could possibly profit from adopting we shall be glad to hear of them.

There is, however, a way in which readers themselves can help us boost sales. It simply is for those currently taking copies to take **more** copies.

It really is very easy. Elsewhere in this issue we have reported on the performance of Lewisham Branch of the British National Party. Regularly every month, this branch manages to take 100 copies for resale — this 100 being separate from 50 more that are taken personally for resale by the Organiser.

Bromley Branch is another party unit which takes a good number of copies: 75 a month — and this is not a large branch.

Most of these copies are sold — at least enough of them to enable the buyers more

or less to break even. A few are given away in the hope that they will induce those receiving them to buy next time, and of course to support the party.

How do these branches manage such good sales? The answer is that they get out and offer the magazine energetically to other Nationalists and to the public.

Bromley branch Organiser Alf Waite does a regular monthly round in which he calls on known Nationalists in his area, not necessarily all BNP members.

Richard Edmonds and his Lewisham branch do likewise.

Enfield Branch, under David Bruce, purchases a large supply for the North London, Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire region. The branch itself takes a good number of this supply and then gets out energetically and sells them. Other batches are sold in 10s and 20s to other party units and groups of individuals (sometimes single individuals alone) in the area.

In East London & Essex region Alan Maloney does the same thing. All these people account for excellent purchases and sales.

Elsewhere in the country, nothing like the same performance is achieved except in Leeds, where the local unit goes about

things energetically. Most others buy a few that they can comfortably dispose of at branch meetings, and that is the end of it; there is no aggressive attempt really to **push** the magazine.

In our series on branch organisation and activities we devoted some months ago a section to literature sales. In this section we spoke of how copies may be disposed of by individuals buying 10 or 20 a month and then selling or giving them away to people they met day-to-day — at work, socially or in the family.

It's so easy. How much are 10 copies a month? £3.20, and on top of that you pay 94p for postage. A total of just over £4. Supposing that you only actually **sell** 3 copies, that leaves you less than £3 out of pocket. At today's monetary values, is that really going to ruin you? You probably earn more than £400 a month — £3 out of £400!

If you take 20 copies, as some do, this will cost you £5.80 with £1.57 over that for postage. Supposing that you have to give away all but 6 of these. You are down about a fiver per month. Is that too big a sacrifice for the cause?

This is the way our magazine is going to get on its feet — by its supporters acting as agents and getting the mag out for us. Let's see more doing it, and we can really grow in circulation and expand the message further and wider!

THE EDITOR



## WHOSE QUEEN? WHOSE COUNTRY?

(Contd. from page 4)

The same thing could be said of another gentleman who could not stomach the views of Mrs. John. This was Mr. Geoffrey O'Brien of Balliol College, who was reported as drawing the biggest cheer of the evening when he interrupted her by saying: "Madam, behind you is a tablet recording the members of this society who laid down their lives in two world wars to give you and your friends the liberty to demonstrate."

Again, this may be considered a very effective reply to the Greenham Common protesters whom Mrs. John represented but it has nothing to do with fighting for Queen and Country. It might be thoroughly appropriate as a reason for voting against such a motion as: "This house would not fight for the freedom of Mrs. Helen John and her band of nuclear disarmers to demonstrate against Cruise missiles" but in fact no such motion was put before the house!

And come to think of it, had that been the motion, would it not have been more apposite for true patriots to vote for it rather than against it? To those really concerned with the defence of Queen and Country and who at the same time retain minds capable of rational thought, the safety of the realm represents a vital strand of the things they believe in and would do battle for. Is the safety of the realm really enhanced by the facility given to Mrs. John and her protesters to make public nuisances of themselves at Britain's defence installations and in the process

tie down large numbers of policemen whose presence is badly needed to combat crime and civil disorder elsewhere?

## EVERY CAUSE BUT BRITAIN

The rest of the speeches in favour of fighting "for Queen and Country" followed in a more or less similar vein to these examples we have quoted. They all cited some cause or interest that would have suffered if Britain had not in the past been prepared to fight, but the peculiar thing about this was that not once included among the causes or interests mentioned was the land of Britain or the British people.

This leads us to ask of the motion concerning whether people should fight for Queen and Country: Whose Queen? And whose Country?

We ask this because the country for which Lord Beloff would be prepared to fight might be very different to the country for which we would be prepared to fight, and his reasons for fighting very different to our reasons for fighting. And exactly the same may be said for The Queen as well. Is it a Queen who personifies, as the British Monarch traditionally used to do, the spirit of sovereign nationhood and who symbolises the bonds between people of British stock across the world? Or is it a Queen who serves as the protector of alien minority interests in this country and of the political system which has become the instrument of those interests?

As if to underline this question, we might conclude by a comment on perhaps the most bizarre aspect of the debate.

Prominent among those who declared from the platform that they would NOT fight for Queen and Country was arch leftist and long-standing public pest Mr. Tariq Ali. What country was Mr. Ali referring to when he affirmed that he would not fight for it? Britain, where he has been residing for the past decade or so? Or Pakistan, where he was born and raised? Because the latter country has no Queen, we must presume that it was Britain that Mr. Ali had in mind. Well, in that case his attitude should be no cause either for surprise or reproach, because he is neither part of this country nor is this country part of him.

But perhaps the debate would have been a little more real if at its outset someone had put the question from the other side of the floor: what the hell is this Asian troublemaker doing taking part in a debate which is about British people's commitment to Britain and therefore none of his damned business?

## IMMIGRANT FIGURES

New figures on immigrants have recently been released by the Census Office which establish clearly that Government estimates of the numbers of immigrants in Britain have been far short of the real truth.

The latest census is of course wholly inadequate, as it does not include Coloured residents of this country who were born here. The figures available, however, do knock for six previous estimates of 1½ million Coloureds in the UK. We will be analysing the newly released figures shortly in this magazine.

## A TASTE OF HOW THEY OPERATE

Chris Carson, a Chicago Greek restaurateur, took his wife's \$1,000 suit to Mort Rubin, a Jewish cleaner. Rubin's shop ruined the suit, then had the chutzpah to send a bill for ruining it. Carson lost his cool and wrote to Rubin: "Jackass: Thanks for destroying my wife's \$1,000 suit and not even trying to do something about it. Should sue you but I'm a Greek and not a kyke."

Rubin claims a "friend" mailed copies of the note to synagogues, businesses, leaders of Jewish organizations and others. According to *Chicago Sun-Times* columnist Mike Royko, "Carson found himself up to his ears in angry Jews." The hate calls began coming in, about 10 a day, along with unsigned hate

letters. A boycott was started and soon Carson's famous ribs were going uneaten.

Carson told all his Jewish friends he wasn't an anti-Semite but they still weren't buying. So, in desperation, he took a lie-detector test. A few sample questions and answers:

"Are you anti-Semitic?" "No."

"Have you made hundreds of donations to Jewish charities in your lifetime?" "Yes."

"Have you bought Jewish bonds on several occasions?" "Yes."

"On the first day of the Six-Day War did you send \$1,000 towards the Israeli war effort anonymously?" "Yes."

"Do you feel you are more Jewish than Greek?" "Yes."

Rubin had to concede, "He's more Jewish than me, it seems." But many Jews refused to get the message, and, three months later, Royko (a Pole) was still trying to rescue Carson's business. The columnist argued that "one word written to one man" had nearly cost Carson a lifetime of hard work, while the self-righteous Rubin, who happens to be a convicted international drug dealer, was never boycotted by anyone. Though Rubin did not need the extra money, he had been caught trying to sell \$400,000 worth of cocaine. The punishment: a \$7,500 fine and probation.

This story was brought to our attention by INSTAURATION, Box 76, Cape Canaveral, Florida 32920, U.S.A.



# FINANCIAL EMERGENCY: LATEST POSITION

DEAR READER,

In our December issue we published a statement saying that *Spearhead* faced a financial crisis, and that we would need to raise a substantial amount of money in donations over and above the normal monthly sums if publication was to be assured well into 1983.


The initial response to this appeal was a very good one and the money came in. This staved off any cessation of publication in the immediate future but it was not enough to achieve the object aimed for, and it is clear that we will need to raise further substantial sums of money for that purpose.

We regretted having to make our original appeal in December, as we knew very well that at that time of the year people are more than usually out of pocket in the meeting of their expenses for the Xmas holiday. Our situation, however, presented us with no alternative, and had not a very good response been forthcoming publication would certainly have ceased.

We are now in a situation where we can be certain of getting out the next two or three issues, but after that publication is not by any means firmly guaranteed. In order to make it so, we need to ask our readers to dip further into their pockets. Now that Xmas has come and gone, we hope that this will be less of an imposition than it was in December.

Please make your cheques out to *Spearhead* and send them to: 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex. We draw your attention to the section of our regular appeal on page 19 where it is stated that we do not normally send receipts for sums under £10 unless these are specifically requested.

Yours sincerely,



JOHN TYNDALL  
(Editor)

The Thunderbolt — action newspaper of the National States Rights Party, P. O. Box 1211, Marietta, Georgia 30061, U. S. A. Send a £5 note for one year's subscription.

## Read NEW FRONTIER Voice of British Nationalism

You can obtain single copies of *New Frontier* by paying a subscription of £3.40 for 12 issues (for subscribers in the British Isles). For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail).

If you wish to obtain *New Frontier* in bulk for redistribution, the rates are:—

10 copies	£1.20	+	32p	post
25 copies	£2.70	+	94p	post
50 copies	£4.80	+	£1.57	post
100 copies	£8.40	+	£1.90	post
150 copies	£12.00	+	£2.10	post
200 copies	£15.00	+	£2.25	post
300 copies	£21.00	+	£2.55	post
400 copies	£26.40	+	£2.80	post
500 copies	£32.00	)	Bulk rates	
1,000 copies	£62.00	)	by roadline	

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *New Frontier*, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB. Please keep orders and enquiries for *New Frontier* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

## How to obtain SPEARHEAD

*Spearhead* is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):—

British Isles: £6.75 ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail: £7.20 ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail: £9.15 ☐

Unsealed air-mail Middle East: £10.10 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Canada, U.S.A., South America and

Africa: £11.70 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £12.60 ☐


**Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling; if remittance is in overseas currency an additional charge of £2 applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.**

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:—

10-19 copies: 32p ea.; 20-49 copies: 29p ea.; 50-99 copies: 24p ea.; 100-199 copies: 21p ea.; 200-499 copies: 18p ea.; 500 copies or over: 16p ea. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: Seacroft, Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.





SIR: I find your comments in the January issue on defence extremely mystifying, although I wholeheartedly agree that we can and must do without American military 'assistance'.

Dealing with your first point, the lesson of the Falklands was surely that we should have kept the islands defended, **not** that the UK needs less defence against possible Russian aggression than previously thought.

You say that Soviet leaders do not intend now or ever to attack Western Europe. **Never?** I venture to suggest that your assertion is but a **theory**, just as the Government had a theory that the Argentines would never invade the Falklands. Theories like the latter one have a way of being disproved. My own theory is that the only guarantee that Russia will not attack Western Europe is for Western Europe to be at least as powerfully armed as the Russians and capable of inflicting crushing reprisals in response to any aggression on the latter's part — and this is the only assumption on which we can afford to act.

If, as you say, the men in the Kremlin are the most realistic of the world's rulers, they will surely have realised that military superiority is among the most effective arguments for attaining their political objectives (which are in conflict with British national interests).

You say that the large Soviet build-up is solely a political weapon, intended to frighten us but not to be used in a full-scale war against us. Again I suggest this is unproven **theory**. This build-up **could** be used in an aggressive war, and I believe it is there with that contingency in view — otherwise it would have no serious power to frighten us.

As to your remarks about long lines of supply, it should be assumed that Russia's lines of supply start, not from Russia itself, but from the East-West German border.

Your remark that Germany came within a hairsbreadth of knocking out Russia hardly seems relevant now in view of the nuclear factor.

Certainly, Western Europe should be capable of defending itself against Russia, but without nuclear deterrence I doubt if we are equipped to do so.

Whatever may be your own conclusions as to present or future Russian intentions, I cannot understand how you can feel sufficiently confident of them to advocate that we can afford to rule out any prospect of future Russian aggression and let down our guard with that in view.

Now to the crux of the matter. Although you argue for an all-British independent nuclear deterrent on British soil, it seems to me that, given your premises to be correct, you have defeated your arguments to support it. If there is no danger of Russian attack, why do we need nuclear bases on British soil?

R. D. MOLESWORTH  
Cheltenham, Glos.

(Editor's reply: Nothing that was said in my original article indicated that Britain or the other Western European nations should 'let down their guard'; on the contrary, they should, as the writer of this letter says, be "as powerfully armed as the Russians and capable of inflicting crushing reprisals in response to any aggression on the latter's part."

Defence planning, however, has to take into account the most likely contingencies of future war and to make the deployment of forces sufficiently flexible to be able to meet any of these contingencies. There is, however, the need to establish some sort of order of priorities, as resources available for defence, even under a Nationalist Government, are never unlimited. This order of priorities must bear some relationship to the order in which such contingencies are likely to occur.

My case is based on the belief that in this latter order there are a number of future contingencies in which Britain might find herself at war which are a great deal more probable than that of a Soviet attack on Western Europe, and that in consequence British defence planning should be conceived with this in view. In some of these contingencies Britain would most probably be acting in concert with other Western powers, though not necessarily the United States, but in some others, as the Falklands proved, she would be acting alone.

Mr. Molesworth says that my estimates are pure theory; well of course all such speculations about the future are. No forward defence planning was ever based on anything other than theory; it is all a question of whether the theory is rationally thought out or not. Theory about future war has to take a great deal of account of the political motives likely to lie at the root of military action by those who may be engaged in such a war, and my view is

that the probable political motives of Russia make it exceedingly unlikely that she would contemplate military action against the West.

Mr. Molesworth says that the military build-up of the Soviet Union would not have the power to frighten us unless it was likely that it would be used. I disagree; it has ample power to frighten us if those who control our news and public opinion interpret it with that object in view — just as the military power of Germany as it built up in the Thirties frightened us because our politicians and media controllers managed to convince most of the British public, against all logic and fact, that that power was intended for use against Britain.

Finally, I would reply to Mr. Molesworth that nowhere have I suggested that we should abandon nuclear weapons or necessarily that they should not be stationed away from British soil.)

SIR: Ray Hill's most timely article should stimulate both discussion and activities in the relation to CND.

Having been involved in local anti-CND activities, I am well aware of the situation Mr Hill has described.

Only recently, while I was handing out BNP leaflets against CND at a demonstration by the latter at RAF Kemble, I was approached by one of the CND organisers, who wanted to know why Nationalists were opposed to CND's demo against US bases in Britain. I was able to answer that one, but it is worth mentioning that in this demo CND were using the Union Jack to make their point.

Perhaps the time has come for the BNP to stage a national campaign on the issue of CND and American bases in Britain. As many parts of the country now have CND activities, and providing we combat CND in the correct manner, a fair amount of local publicity should be obtained, as it has here in Gloucestershire.

I also think we should make it clear where we stand in relation to Europe if one day the US forces did pull out. Other nations, including West Germany, would also want to defend themselves. Are we then to have a situation with more nations having nuclear weapons? I think we should make ourselves clear on such issues.

R. L. RHODES  
Quedgeley, Gloucester

(Editor's note: If it is the purpose of the writer to propose that the BNP have a policy on whether such nations as West Germany should have nuclear weapons, it should be said that our party cannot have a policy on matters which lie outside this country's control)




# Know your party officers

*It has been suggested to SPEARHEAD that we should publish and make known the identities of the people running the British National Party. We agree, and here are brief portraits of seven national officials of the party which we print for our readers' interest.*




**John Tyndall**




**Charles Parker**



**Violet Parker**



**David Bruce**



**Richard Edmonds**



**Ronald Rickcord**



**Ray Hill**

## **JOHN TYNDALL (Party Leader)**

Mr. Tyndall is responsible for overall direction of party affairs: for the making of policy, for the appointment of other officers, for the framing of the party's rules and for major executive decisions. He has been active in Nationalist politics since 1956 and was Leader of the National Front during its most successful years in the 1970s. He is also Editor and Publisher of *Spearhead* magazine. His wife Valerie is daughter of National Organiser Charles Parker. Mr. and Mrs. Tyndall have one daughter.

## **CHARLES PARKER (National Organiser)**

Mr. Parker is responsible for organising and making decisions concerning the party's nationwide network of regions, branches and groups. All matters concerning these affairs should be referred to him. Mr. Parker is a retired engineer who lost his right arm while on service in World War II.

## **MRS. VIOLET PARKER (Head of Administration)**

Mrs. Parker is the wife of National Organiser Charles Parker. She is responsible for the running of the Headquarters administration of the party, at which task she works very long hours without payment.

## **DAVID BRUCE (Activities Organiser)**

Mr. Bruce is responsible for the organisation and direction of major party activities where a national mobilisation of members is required. He is also Organiser of the North London, Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire Region. A sales representative, he is married with one son.

## **RICHARD EDMONDS (Chairman YN)**

Mr. Edmonds is the Chairman of the Young Nationalists, the party's youth section. He is also Organiser of the South London Region of the party. He is almost certainly the party's leading street activist in the London area and possibly the whole country, giving up almost the whole of his spare hours to promote and lead literature sales, leafletting and other activities. He is an engineer by profession and is single.

## **RONALD RICKCORD (Editor of *New Frontier*)**

Mr. Rickcord somehow manages to combine the very arduous task of editing a paper which appears regularly every month with doing a full-time job outside the party, something which requires considerable labour and dedication. In addition to this, he still finds time to write regular articles for *Spearhead* and run the local branch in his home area of Milton Keynes. He is a technical author by profession and is married with 3 children.

## **RAY HILL (Publicity Officer)**

Mr. Hill is responsible principally for producing ideas for activities designed to get the party in the headlines and for other publicity schemes. He is also one of the party's leading platform speakers. He is a director of a knitwear firm in Leicester and is married with three children.



## New recordings now available!

*BNP Recordings are pleased to announce two new cassettes which will be available from early in the new year. These are:—*

### RALLY '82

This recording features speeches made at the British National Party rally in London on October 16th 1982, the theme of which was 'Unite and fight for Britain's future!'

On side 1 of the cassette are recordings of the speeches by Charles Parker and Ray Hill; on side 2 is the closing speech by John Tyndall.

### TYNDALL SPEAKS (II)

This cassette features the 4th and 5th of a series of specially recorded talks by John Tyndall, made in a studio employing Hi-Fi equipment. The talks are:—

Side 1: **The case for nationalism.** In this talk the BNP leader demolishes the most frequently used arguments employed in opposition to the nationalist idea and urges that that idea is now essential to Britain's survival.

Side 2: **Tragedy of the 20th Century.** In this recording Tyndall speaks of World War II and its ruinous consequences for Britain and the West.

Both these talks provide ideal instructional material for educating young people in nationalism.

We also remind everyone of two other recordings still available which have proved very popular. These are:—

### VOICES OF NATIONALISM

Side 1 of this cassette features recordings of parts of the speeches made at the Nationalist Unity rally in London on September 5th 1981. Hear John Tyndall, Ray Hill, Kenneth McWilliam, Len Bearsford Walker and others.

Side 2 consists of the third of the series of specially recorded talks by John Tyndall entitled **The coming British revolution.** In this talk Tyndall exposes the fraud of the political system masquerading as 'democracy' and outlines vital changes needed to raise the level of British political leadership.

### TYNDALL SPEAKS (I)

The first two recorded talks of a series by the BNP leader. These are:—

Side 1: **Our Anglo-Saxon heritage.** This talk is about the great world-wide heritage of the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic peoples and calls for their unity.

Side 2: **Britain's economic crisis.** Tyndall speaks about the breakdown of the British economy over a long period and calls for a new economic policy based on economic nationalism.

*Cassettes now cost £3.50 each — plus 16½p for postage. All orders should be sent to: BNP Recordings, Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.*

## YOUNG NATIONALIST

Read *Young Nationalist* the paper for youth published on behalf of the Youth Section of the British National Party. Send 20p for sample copy to: 16 Vale Lodge, Perry Vale, London S.E.23.

# BNP to open book service

For some time now British National Party supporters have clamoured for the party to open its own book service. Not the least good reason for this has been that these supporters, unable to obtain the books they want from the party, have had to purchase them from other, sometimes hostile, political organisations.

Up to now the party has delayed opening any book service of its own because it was believed that this would place an unacceptable burden on the office staff. Now this problem has been overcome, however, and the party has announced that it will be opening its own book service shortly. The service will begin with be a mail order one and will operate from an address in

London. At the present time the organisation is in the process of being set up, a stock of books purchased and booklists prepared. As soon as the books and lists are available, we will be advertising them to all *Spearhead* readers.

This is a great step forward for the party which all should welcome.

## Party badge

After a long wait, we are now pleased to announce that British National Party badges will be available from about the middle of March. The badges will cost £1.25 each (including postage) and may be obtained from: BNP, Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

## Let's have more news!

MANY READERS have written to us and said how much they like reading internal news reports on what is happening in the British National Party — news of activities, the party's progress, information about people in the party, and so on. We have been asked to print more on these subjects.

We would be only too happy to do so. The volume and interest of our BNP internal news reports, however, depends on how the party's branches supply us with news. If we don't get it, we can't print it.

There is a great deal going on in the party at branch level, and we want our readers to hear about it. Where we are missing out, however is in the quality and promptness of our information service that **informs** us of what is going on. Some branches do supply this and we print what we think ought to be printed about it. A great many branches, however, have fallen down in this regard; they expect us to hear from little birds what they are doing!

So let's have more news from around the country, and then our readers will get the greater volume of news that they obviously want.

And another thing — we want, not just reports, but photos as well: photos of activities and of personalities. Make sure you send in black-and-white photos though; coloured ones are quite useless for reproduction in print!

We hope that by next month this message will have got some response, and we can then print a much fuller and more interesting party news section than in the past.

## Bankruptcy case: latest news

LAST YEAR *Spearhead* revealed to readers the circumstances in which Editor John Tyndall was facing bankruptcy as a consequence of legal costs awarded against him in a court action brought by the agents of the 'Excalibur Canteen and Refreshment Club' (in reality the Fountaine/Kavanagh faction which tried to smash the National Front, of which Mr. Tyndall was then Chairman, in 1979. An appeal was made to readers to assist Mr. Tyndall to raise money whereby this bankruptcy could be avoided.

As a result of this appeal, a group of readers offered to make a sum of money available which, along with other sums contributed, would enable Mr. Tyndall to make an offer of settlement to the party concerned. This offer was made and it was rejected.

As a consequence, Mr. Tyndall was declared officially bankrupt at the end of last year. He has now made an application to the court for discharge from bankruptcy and this application is due to be heard on the 16th of this month. The money pledged by readers to help Mr. Tyndall has now been offered as a contribution to settlement of debts in pursuit of this application. We will keep all readers informed of news on this matter.



# Lewisham leads London

In view of the dominant role played by the London area in the history of British Nationalism, London active strength of the British National Party should account for a greater proportion of total party strength than it does. It is in London, however, that the divisions felt by the Nationalist movement are most acute, and where the BNP cannot yet claim to have won over the majority of Nationalists. This picture is gradually altering and the balance of power is slipping the BNP's way, but the process still has some way to go.

But if the BNP is not yet dominant in London this is certainly not the fault of the Lewisham Branch, which certainly is one of the party's finest active units in the country — perhaps indeed the finest.

In literature sales, for instance, Lewisham is way out on its own. The branch regularly takes and sells **400 copies per month** of the party newspaper *New Frontier*, about 100 of which are sold on the doorstep and most of the remaining 300 on the streets. In addition to this, the branch disposes of 100 copies per month of *Spearhead* apart from a further 50 copies which are sold by Organiser Richard Edmonds alone. It can perhaps be appreciated why there is some impatience at Headquarters when some branches around the country write in and say they are having difficulty in selling 50 *New Frontiers* per month!

## LEADERSHIP

Lewisham manages the figures of sales that it does, not because in numbers of activists it is necessarily better endowed than other branches — we know many that are numerically on a par with Lewisham — but because the branch has a superb **quality** of activist and above all superb branch **leadership**. Elsewhere in this issue we have made mention of Richard Edmonds as possibly the party's finest street activist anywhere in Britain. Totally dedicated to the cause, Richard Edmonds succeeds in infusing his own positive attitude to activities into the members under him, and the magnificent record of the branch is the result.

In addition to being very busy in Lewisham itself — well known as one of Britain's most notorious areas of immigrant concentration and crime — the branch more than pulls its weight in activities further afield, sending detachments to marches and rallies all over the country — again with Richard Edmonds always leading from the front. Mr. Edmonds, however, wishes



Richard Edmonds (second right and in background) leads group of paper-sellers in a street in Lewisham

us in mentioning the branch to name also Adam Saunders, Les Taylor and 'Jim' (who prefers to be known just by that name) as worthy of special praise as active helpers.

At the coming General Election the branch will be contesting the Lewisham East and Lewisham West constituencies. It is also well able to contest the third seat in the borough, Deptford, but by agreement is standing down in that area to avoid fighting against Dr. Robert Mitchell, a popular Nationalist candidate who will be standing ind-

ependently rather than on behalf of any specific Nationalist faction. It might be said, while mentioning this, that Lewisham BNP members are on very good terms with members of other Nationalist factions in the area — an example from which the national leaders of the latter might learn.

Lewisham branch will also be raising money to finance other BNP candidates in South London, of which Richard Edmonds is Regional Organiser in addition to his duties with the branch.

## SPEARHEAD FUND

*Spearhead*, in this difficult period for British Nationalism, has only been kept alive by the loyalty of its most steadfast readers and by the generosity of particular supporters who have made sacrifices from out of their own pockets to help us continue in print.

Many former readers have felt unable to renew their subscriptions because of unemployment and the consequent need for financial economies. We have also had to sustain considerable losses in bulk sales as a result of the present division among British Nationalist groups.

These factors have made us all the more dependent upon the donations we can obtain from our small circle of committed loyalists. We can only ask that those in this circle maintain their contributions in the coming months and that others who have not previously donated beyond paying the bare price of their copies now try to do so. This is essential if we are to continue in publication.

We remind all those making financial donations that it is not our custom to send receipts automatically except for sums of £10 or over. This is in order to save the time of our office staff and economise on postage. If, however, any donor of less than £10 should desire confirmation that their donation has been received, would they please enclose an S.A.E. with the donation.

All contributions should be sent to *Spearhead*, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.



# TRUTH STOOD ON ITS HEAD

**Another Anti-Nazi soap opera to bore the viewers**

Last month we commented on a TV programme about Germany 50 years after Hitler's coming to power. This of course was not the only occasion the oblong screen was devoted to that theme, and we cannot resist this month commenting on another TV feature recalling the Nazi revolution.

This was a three-part series called *The Oppermanns*. Produced in Germany and broadcast with English sub-titles, it was about a Jewish family of furniture dealers based in Berlin in 1933 and it recounted the experiences of members of that family just prior to and immediately following the take-over by Hitler.

One scene was of a schoolroom where the bright young Oppermann Junior was required to stand before the class and give a verbal dissertation on Hermann's victory over the Romans in 9 AD. The good Yiddishe boy had done a bit of swotting on the battle and come to the conclusion that its outcome was more the result of Roman bungling and pure luck than Teutonic heroism. This greatly displeased his ardent Nazi history teacher, who took the matter to the school headmaster, an elderly liberal, demanding that the youth be made to stand up before the whole school and make an abject apology. The headmaster was not at all happy about such a proposition but his Nazi subordinate then proceeded to get the local party machine to put pressure upon him to come to heel. Eventually the old gentleman, faced with the prospect of the loss of his job and retirement pension, gave in and requested his Jewish pupil to apologise as demanded.

In another part of the series, one of the partners in the Jewish firm was visited by a Nazi Party official who was also his emp-

loyee. The official demanded that his boss give the sack to certain Jewish members of the staff and hire Germans in their place. His boss at first declined but was later duly persuaded after having been called upon in the small hours of the morning by a posse of Brownshirts and forced to spend a night in the latter's custody.

At the time that the mainly Jewish directors of the firm sensed the imminence of the Hitler take-over they got in a huddle to

One of the Jewish Oppermanns in the film



decide how best to protect their interests. The plan they decided upon was to change the name of their company and reorganise it so as to give it more of an 'Aryan' look. This involved the co-operation of certain non-Jewish business associates, one of whom was — yes, you've guessed it! — a Hitler follower. The latter gentleman was shrewd enough to perceive that the situation presented a golden opportunity for a take-over — on terms highly favourable to himself and highly unfavourable to his Jewish partner, and to which the latter's assent could of course be obtained by means of intimidation through the Nazi network!

Needless to say, the film would not have been complete without a shot of the legendary Nazi boycott of Jewish shops. In this scene the Jewish managing director arrived at his shop one morning to find the Brownshirts outside demonstrating and urging the public to "kauf nicht bei Juden!" Rather miraculously, he was allowed by the Brownshirt leader to go into the shop unmolested, which surely must have been a slip-up by the makers of the film!

At the end of the series one was struck by the thought that there was a familiar ring of truth about it all — yes, *truth!* The only thing different from actual experience was that throughout the roles were reversed. In real life it is Gentiles and sometimes racial patriots and Nationalists who find themselves in the positions occupied in the film by the Oppermanns — their children harassed and persecuted in school for displaying views not acceptable to a predominantly anti-Nationalist teaching profession; teachers themselves threatened with the loss of their jobs for the same reasons; businessmen harassed by officials of the race relations industry for hiring employees of their own choice; their businesses subject to rapacious take-overs by Jewish consortia; finally their finding themselves the victims of business boycotts as a result of falling out of favour of the Jews.

It certainly needs *Chutzpah* to put on a colossal production (*The Oppermanns* was shown all over the world) which portrays your enemies in an image so close to your own and accuses them of all the vices and tricks of which you are yourself the master.

But of course we Gentiles cannot complain. If we behave like whipped curs and collaborate in the promotion of this garbage who can blame our overlords for putting it across over us?

## Find out about the British National Party

Send 20p for information pack.

To:  
P.O. BOX 115  
HOVE  
E. SUSSEX BN3 3SB  
(Tel. 0273 777540)

Name.....

Address.....

I enclose.....